



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,643	05/18/2006	Stefan Parhofer	S118.12-0007	9374
27367 7590 12/03/2008 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A. SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244				
EXAMINER				
HAYES, BRET C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3641				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/579,643

**Applicant(s)**

PARHOFFER ET AL.

**Examiner**

BRET HAYES

**Art Unit**

3641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 11 and 13-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 11 and 13-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 11 and 13-23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 May 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because details shown in Fig. 2 are not visible due to shading. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because: line 4, "The Safety device" should be --The safety device--; and, lines 4 and 7, the term "means" is used (with safety), which is unacceptable. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The use of the trademark Bluetooth™ has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 1, 19, 20 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: at least claim 1 and preferably claim 23 should a verb of some sort between the preamble and the body of the claim, such as, “comprises”, “comprising”, “includes”, “including”, “consists of”, or “consisting of”, as claims are to be in one sentence form and a sentence requires a verb.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claims 19 and 20 recite “blue tooth,” which is a trademark. See paragraph 4 above: generic terminology must be included.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. Claims 1 – 7, 10, 11 and 13 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Some claims recite the term(s), “it”, “its”, etc. These are to be replaced with the referenced element(s) for clarity as what the term(s) refer to is open to broad interpretation and presumably unintentionally ambiguous.

9. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim

does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 11 recites the broad recitation "approximately 20 cm to 1.5 m," and the claim also recites "and preferably approximately 80 cm," which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation. Also, claims 19 and 20 recite the broad recitation "the safety means is programmable preferably wireless," and the claims also recite "more preferably by a bidirectional wireless signal transmission," "preferably based on a Challenge response algorithm," and the claims even further recite "even more preferably with a magnetic frequency of approximately 25kHz or via blue tooth interfaces."

10. Claims 13 and 14 recite the limitation "different transponders," which is unclear as only "a transponder" has been previously recited in claim 1. Examiner suggests reciting: --a first transponder-- initially and --a second transponder--subsequently; or, --at least one transponder-- initially, to clarify.

11. Claim 15 recites the limitation "the wearer's eminences of hand" in lines 3 and 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Further, it is not clear what is meant by 'an eminence of hand'.

12. Regarding claim 17, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

*Allowable Subject Matter*

13. Claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

14. Claims 2 – 7, 10, 11 and 13 – 23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

15. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record neither discloses nor fairly teaches the recited limitations of the claimed invention including, but not limited to the combination including: a transponder comprising a switch for activation for a given period of time, the switch comprising a biometric sensor; a safety means for a grip of a weapon activated by a user's hand, upon activation emitting a wireless request signal; the transponder emitting an authentication signal upon receipt of the request signal from the safety means; the safety means further receiving and processing the authentication signal from the transponder; and the safety means permitting firing only by the user upon receipt of the authentication signal from the transponder for either a given number of shots or a given period of time.

16. This statement is not intended to necessarily state all the reasons for allowance or all the details why the claims are allowed and has not been written to specifically or impliedly state that all the reasons for allowance are set forth (MPEP 1302.14).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Bret Hayes at telephone number (571) 272 – 6902 or email address [bret.hayes@uspto.gov](mailto:bret.hayes@uspto.gov), which is preferred. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm, Eastern Standard Time.

The Central FAX Number is **571-273-8300**.

If attempts to contact the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone, can be reached at (571) 272 – 6873.

/Bret Hayes/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3641

3-Dec-08